# The Shakespeare Newsletter

Vol. X: No. 3 "Knowing I lov'd my books, he furnish'd me . . ." May, 1960

## 92 Nations Pay Shakespeare Homage; Festival Plays Attracts Thousands

On April 23 - the 396th Anniversary of the Birth of Shakespeare - the flags of ninety-two nations were unfurled in a striking ceremony of homage to the international poet. Representatives of seventy of the nations were there to do the honors for their country. The now traditional procession to the Birthplace and Holy Trinity Church was called a "crocodile of colour" by a local correspondent. In a dinner earlier in the afternoon Professor Allardyce Nicoll noted the burgeoning of worldwide festivals and noted that most of them are honoring native playwrights. His gloomy forecast of the future of the theatre was echoed by J. B. Priestly who noted that in the past four years 175 theatres in England had closed. If their work was not good —Professor Nicoll had decried plays about "dismal neurotic women and tedious male misfits"— Priestly reminded his listeners that it was out of a rough and tumble theatre that Shakespeare grew.

The Two Gentlemen of Verona which opened on April 5th was praised by Edmund Gardner of The Stratford-upon-Avon Herald who liked the stagecraft and beauty of Peter Hall's production. He found the continual use of the revolving stage more clever than fussy.

Michael Langham's production of The Merchant of Venice (April 12) was set in the 18th century and featured a virile, rather than an aged Shylock, with a thick Israeli accent. Peter O'Toole played the role. He was not the cringing usurer but a dignified gentleman who took a cruel revenge when ill-used. (W. A. Darlington in the N. Y. Times, April 13).

### Previously Reported

STRATFORD, CONN.: Opens June 8 With seasoned stars like Katharine Hepburn as Viola and Cleopatra; Morris Carnovsky as Feste, and Prospero; and Earle Hyman as Caliban, the 6th Annual American Shakespeare Festival at Stratford, Connecticut anticipates another successful season. Miss Hepburn previously starred at Stratford as Portia and Beatrice.

The Season opens with Jack Landau's Twelfth Night, and is followed by William Ball's Tempest and Jack Landau's Antony and Cleopatra. The repertory closes on September 11.

ASHLAND, OREGON: Opens July 25. Offering The Taming of the Shrew, Julius Caesar, The Tempest, Richard II, and Webster's Duchess of Malfi. Annual Shakespeare Institute under Professor Margery Bailey of Stanford University. Runs to September 3.

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA: Opens July 5. Offering Julius Caesar As You Like It, and Hamlet. Runs to September 4th.

## Free N. Y. C. Shakespeare Festival Nears Financial Goal With Gifts

As the target date of May 30 approached, The New York City Shakespeare Festival drew close to reaching its goal of $110,000 for presentation of three plays in the coming season. Latest gift was from the New York Foundation which informed Joseph Papp, organizer of the Festival, and Mr. Stanley H. Lowell, Chairman of the Mayor's Committee for Free Shakespeare, that it was giving a $25,000 gift contingent on the raising of an equivalent amount from other sources. A total of $78,000 had already been raised, $20,000 of it by a dinner and entertainment on May 8 at the Commodore Hotel in New York. The "Evening with Shakespeare" at a cost of $50 a plate had almost 600 guests.

Henry V will be the first play on the program with Measure for Measure and the Taming of the Shrew to follow.

## THIRD COLORADO FESTIVAL AT BOULDER OFFERS THREE PLAYS

The Colorado Shakespeare Festival which has been widely acclaimed in the Middle West will open its third annual Festival on July 30. Festival founder and executive director J. H. Crouch is offering I Henry IV, Antony and Cleopatra, and Twelfth Night in a repertory that lasts until August 13. The fast moving plays and richly colored costumes last year attracted over 10,000 spectators, and earned comments of "excellent" from Robert L. Perkins of The Rocky Mountain News.

The Mary Rippon Theatre in which the plays are staged was especially designed for outdoor productions of Shakespearean plays by the noted stage historian George F. Reynolds more than 20 years ago. The Shakespeare Festival is part of the University Theatre and Creative Arts Program of the University of Colorado. Actors in the plays are college students chosen on a scholarship basis and selected from applicants throughout the United States.

Francis Hodge of the University of Texas will direct I H IV, Gerald Kahan of the University of Georgia will direct TN, and J. H. Crouch will direct A & C. The nightly succession of plays makes it possible to see three plays on consecutive nights.

## COMEDY OF ERRORS AT CLEVELAND

A lively performance of The Comedy of Errors in Renaissance dress was presented by the Cleveland Play House under the direction of Kirk Willis. This performance of Shakespeare's farce was the 21st in a series that has been presented except for the war years, since 1934.

The Play House performances are especially directed at High School audiences who come from 150 schools in all parts of Northeastern Ohio to see the plays at a special price of 80 cents. Last year 18,000 students saw MacBeth. This year students had a special treat in seeing Shakespeare in the original as well as in a streamlined version as The Boys from Syracuse, the Rodgers and Hart's musical version.

The setting by Paul Rodgers, the acting by capable professional actors and some very talented apprentices, and directing were extremely well done and any reservations we had are based only on a slightly different conception of certain characters—for example we would have preferred a serious Luciana. Of the three productions of this play seen by the editor, this was the first that treated the Aegeon-Solinus episode at the beginning as serious business.

### Four Histories in Ohio Festival

Four of Shakespeare's history plays— Richard II, 1 and 2 Henry IV, and Henry V, are planned for the third annual Shakespeare-under-the-stars Festival at Stan Hywet Hall in Akron, Ohio. Against the splendid backdrop of the fabulous Tudor mansion built by the Seiberling family the four plays will be presented from July 5 onward. After the four plays have been introduced into the repertory, a few weeks will be devoted to presentation of the tetralogy on successive nights. Manager Arthur Litgow who is widely known for his direction of the five year Shakespeare Festival at Antioch College from 1952 to 1956 is coordinating the activities which include Round-Table discussions. Edward Call who was associated with Mr. Lithgow for a while in the Antioch Festival will direct the plays with a professional acting company including John Carradine, Jr. Special student and group rates will be available. For further details write Mr. Lithgow at Stan Hywet Hall, Akron 3, Ohio, or to the editor of SNL.

### Canadian Stratford Expecting Over 200,000

An advance sale of 72,000 seats for the 8th Annual Shakespearean Festival at Stratford, Ontario, Canada, indicates that the season's total will reach 210,000, said Victor C. Polley, Administrative Director of the Festival.

Artistic Director Michael Langham, back from directing a very successful Merchant of Venice at the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre in England is preparing his production of Romeo and Juliet, Douglas Campbell is at work on A Midsummer Night's Dream, and Douglas Seale is ready with his King John which will open the season in June 27.

The Shakespeare Seminar being conducted by the Universities of Canada in conjunction with the Festival has received applications from New Brunswick to California. Dr. Charles J. Sisson of the Shakespeare Institute in England, Tyrone Guthrie the noted director, and others will lecture from July 17 to July 22. Information is available from Peter D. Smith at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario.

### Seminary Courses Offer Unusual Shakespeare Insights

The Union Theological Seminary in New York City stresses Shakespeare in two of the courses it offers as part of its special program around Drama and the Christian Faith. The courses which explore the connection between Christian faith and the art of the drama were first made possible by a Rockefeller Foundation grant for 1956-59 and now extended for another three years. The function of the program in part is to deepen the understanding of the Christian faith. To achieve this end Tom F. Driver introduces Shakespeare into his Christianity and Tragedy course. Dr. Driver discusses the extent to which Christian thought has brought about changes in the writing and understanding of tragedy and then discusses the similarities and differences between the understanding of death and suffering in the Christian faith. Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, and Macbeth are studied to show that Christian thought has changed the understanding of tragedy without destroying the idea of tragedy. Christianity transcends but does not negate the tragic view. Christianity embraces tragedy and the individual Christian life often seems tragic. Thus Dr. Driver agrees with Herbert Weissinger's view that tragedy is written only where faith and doubt are both present, and that this is the situation we have in Christian life.

In a seminar course taught by Dr. Driver, Shakespeare's histories are read after a survey of philosophers of history and theologians who interpret the meaning of history. Dr. Driver's The Sense of History in Greek and Shakespearean Drama (Columbia University Press, May, 1960) covers the insights in this course.

Scholarships for the special program are available.

## The Shakespeare Quadricentennial - 1964

For more than a year - in fact even before I started my History of Shakespeare's Reputation, I was wondering about the extent of the celebration that would take place in 1964. Perhaps the first time was when in 1946 I saw a Hungarian stamp which pictured William Shakespeare and wanted immediately to suggest the same to our own Post Office department. But the Post Office needs occasions more relative and I could find none earlier than 1964.

For the first two hundred years there were no centennial commemorations. It was not until the Stratford Corporation sought to fill a niche in its newly erected Town Hall at the expense of David Garrick and Garrick decided to exploit the occasion with a Jubilee that Stratford had any celebration at all. That was in 1769. Minor celebrations were held in some years and rather elaborate ones in 1827 and 1830, but the 1864 Tricentennial was an elaborate affair, long planned, and much argued. London wanted to be its scene. Stratford claimed priority and Stratford won. In our collection we have a 96 page Official Programme of the Tercentenary Festival, an unused ticket to Twelfth Night for April 26, 1964, and a complete history of the festival written by Robert E. Hunter in the same year. The trials and tribulations of the Festival Committee, their controversy with the London press and the noted actors who were insulted and withdrew their services, the elaborate pavillion that was built - all makes a fascinating history down to the melancholy end at the auction of the dismantled building and furnishings. Garrick had lost 2000 pounds in 1769; there was a deficit in 1864, but Shakespeare reigned supreme for a while and all was well. Some of this fascinating story we have told in our History.

With the building of the first Shakespeare Memorial Theatre in 1879, festivals became a regular event so that in 1960 the flags of 92 nations were unfurled at Stratford, seventy of them by the natives of the country involved.

Today with at least sixty-five nations having translated editions of Shakespeare, a Shakespeare Quadricentennial Celebration should be an international event of outstanding success and The Shakespeare Newsletter would like to foster and support every possible step to make it all that it should be.

Moscow, Bonn, London, and Stratford already have annual programs. Other communities have local celebrations. There is need for a central committee to organize the local, national and international activities and there should be branches in virtually every cultural community in the world.

The Birthplace Trust in England, The Shakespeare Association of America in the United States, subscribers to The Shakespeare Newsletter if otherwrise unaffiliated, members of the Shakespeare Clubs of the world, committees of producers, actors, and directors of Shakespeare at the various world festivals, educational leaders and associations with affiliations in every institution of learning, and other literary and cultural groups will have to be welded together and their plans coordinated.

Proposals for a Shakespeare Day have been made in the past and can be made again. Commemorative volumes will be published, plays and similar programs presented, dinners held, monuments and plaques erected, scholarly meetings convened, stamps and medals issued, exhibits shown, gardens planted, radio, T.V., and movies prepared, Shakespeare collections given to libraries, supplements to newspapers and magazines issued, music composed, portraits painted and "discovered," and new abuse from the heretics aired.

After a while all will wane, but one thing I hope will be inspired and continued an International Shakespeare Association with cooperating scholars to work out some of the problems and perform some of the tasks that can only be done when a coordinated group of minds work together on a single project.

More of this anon.

### International Theatre Federation

Three years ago the International Federation for Theatre Research was founded to foster research in theatre history, to assist in the foundation of national branches, to organize international conferences, to establish an International Centre of Theatre Research, and to promote relations with other historical and artistic groups, etc.

One of its achievements thus far is the establishment of Theatre Research (Recherches Theatrales), a bilingual publication in English and French issued three times a year. A copy of Vol. I, No. 1 (March 1958) is before us and it appears to be a very worthy addition to a field in which there are few publications at all. Three of the articles are bibliographical: W. G. B. Carson's essay "The Theatre of the American Frontier: A Bibliographical Essay" with 46 items listed: Olive E. B. Youngs' "Important Articles on the Theatre in The Times Literary Supplement, 1902-1956" with about 80 items in the first installment; and Gisela Schwanbeck's "Theses on Theatre Research (Federal German Republic, 1955-57), tabulating about 60 items into 15 categories.

In Alois M. Nagler's "A Terminology for Sixteenth-Century Stage Forms," the Yale professor attempts definitions of the Reaissance stages which were in a transitional phase during the period. I append his definition of "The Elizabethan Public Stage (last quarter of the sixteenth century)": From polyscenic juxta-position (Peele's The Old Wives' Tale) to the dynamic monoscenic stage of succession (e.g. in Romeo and Juliet, when the stage represented successively: a public place in "fair Verona"—a room in Capulet's house—a street—a hall, etc.; frequently non-localized scenes in many plays); non-illusionistic (street scenes) or semi-illusionistic (when using mansion-type set-pieces such as a bower, a battlemented wall, a prison). Outlook for the seventeenth century: the medieval elements were on the defensive, though they were firmly entrenched on the "conservative" Red-Bull stage; on "progressive" stages, however, such as the Globe and Blackfriars, the baroque principle of (non-illusionistic) dynamic succession was gaining control.

Membership for individuals is 20 Swiss francs a year (24c per franc). Subscription to the magazine alone is 12.50 francs. Information may be obtained from Ifan Kyrle Fletcher, 22 Buckingham Gate, London, S. W.1, England.

### The Humanity of Shakespeare

"Shakespeare instructs us to be human and to take our humanity seriously. He instructs us to see in ourselves, as well as in others, the strange paradox which is man, reflecting the divine in whose image he is created, and the deep stain of sin which is not to be cleared with a little water. And he dares to point both to the strength and to the weakness of the human situation.

To the strength, because of what man can become in his nobility. To his weakness because of the drag of sin, portrayed so terribly by the dark inevitable pull of supernatural evil.

So it is that Shakespeare refuses to see the world of men in terms of cowboys and Indians or cops and robbers: with the simply good on the one side, and the simply bad on the other. He refuses to pigeon-hole: to classify into easy categories. He refuses to make snap decisions about people on first sight.

And he treats kings and clowns, the clever and stupid, the good and the bad with like respect. For he knows that kings can be clowns, and clowns can be kings. And the clever can be stupid and the stupid wise, and that there is plenty of goodness in the worst and rottenness in the best. And who can better this instruction?

(From a sermon by E. H. Patey at Holy Trinity Church, Stratford-upon-Avon, on Sunday, April 23, 1960.)

## DISSERTATION DIGEST

Edited by
Jack R. Brown, Marshall College

**Shakespeare's Garter Play: "The Merry Wives of Windsor," William Green, Columbia University, 1959, 282 pages.**

The seeming "jumble of elements" in The Merry Wives of Windsor falls into a coherent pattern when we see the play as composed for performance at Whitehall before Queen Elizabeth and the Knights of the Garter on April 23, 1597. It seems probable that George Carey, Lord Hunsdon, commissioned Shakespeare to write the work for such production in response to the Queen's wish to see Falstaff in love. On April 17 Hunsdon was made Lord Chamberlain, and on April 23 he was elected a Knight of the Garter. The "grand affair" at the castle, undoubtedly a Garter installation, looks forword to the installation of Hunsdon, Shakespeare's patron, about a month after the original performance of the play.

In the period 1593-1602 the only probable occasion for a performance of The Merry Wives of Windsor at a Garter Feast was in 1597, at Whitehall. Lord Hunsdon had ample foreknowledge of his new honors to commission the writing of the play and sufficient influence to arrange a special Court performance.

The dissertation includes also a study of the Q and F versions of the text, and an analysis of The Merry Wives of Windsor in relation to Shakespeare's other work in the period around 1597.

### Glamis Castle

Glamis Castle, the birthplace of the Queen Mother and of Princess Margaret of England, was remodeled in the seventeenth century to resemble a French chateau. It is now open for tourists from May through September. Admission is 35c for adults and 20c for children.

THE PRINCIPLES & PRACTICE OF CRITICISM

Hamlet
The Merry Wives
Othello

by ALLAN GILBERT

Table of Contents: I Literary Criticism & Interpretation — Why Criticism? — Greek Criticism — Plato — Aristotle — Some Later Critics — Criticism and Scholarship II OTHELLO— Comedy in Othello — Othello — Iago — Desdemona — The Nature of the Drama III THE MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR — The "Rejection" of the Falstaff of The Merry Wives — The Tradition of Queen Elizabeth's Request — The Date — Falstaff in The Merry Wives and in Henry IV — Comedy Versus Historical Play — Does The Merry Wives Give Pleasure IV HAMLET—Hamlet's Delay— Hamlet's Witty Speeches — The Nature of the Play.

"Professor Gilbert's examination of Plato's attitude toward poetry, his own treatment of 'comic relief,' his answer to the basic question, 'Why criticism?' — all illustrate the clarity, vigor, and originality of a truly distinguished professor of literature." —The English Journal.

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
DETROIT 2, MICHIGAN

## STUDIES IN ENGLISH RENAISSANCE DRAMA

Published by N.Y.U. Press, 1959

### "Then I Denie You Starres: A Reading of Romeo and Juliet"

**Irving Ribner, Tulane University**

An examination of Romeo and Juliet provides much information about Shakespeare's growth as a tragedian, for it presents his first original adaptation and combination of traditional forms of tragedy. From various treatments of the story Shakespeare inherited the Senecan formula, the tragic pattern being mainly the retribution for sin, as the young lovers move to an inevitable doom decreed by an inexorable fate. But, Professor Ribner asserts, Shakespeare's play is far more than a tragedy of fate. It embodies a view of life far more significant and meaningful than what the Senecan stereotypes could present: it is an exploration of the operation of divine providence, profoundly Christian in context. Romeo and Juliet is thus an "education" play, tracing the growth of Romeo from a creature of passion to a man of reason. In this connection, the reading of two lines is crucial. "O, I am fortune's fool" (III,i,141) is the low point in Romeo's slow journey to maturity; in it he asserts a capricious, lawless Fortune. "Romeo here sees the universe as a mindless chaos, without guiding plan; he is proclaiming a philosophy of despair." Perhaps even more crucial, after Romeo has thrown off despair, is his response to the news of Juliet's supposed death. Here the author prefers the good quarto of 1599, which reads: "Is it in so? then I denie you starres." For "the design of the tragedy does not call at this point for a Byronic defiance of fate ("I defy you stars"- . . . The design calls for an escape from Fortune's oppression through an acceptance of the order of the universe, and this meaning is implicit in 'I denie you Starres.' " This is the Renaissance view, and it produces an "affirmation in Shakespeare that the ultimate plan of the universe is good, for out of the suffering of individuals the social order is cleansed of evil. The deep-rooted family feud is finally brought to an end." (SERD, 1959, pp. 269-86.)

### "Julius Caesar: A Play Without Political Bias"

**Vernon Hall, Jr., Dartmouth College**

Taking exception to the many political interpretations of Julius Caesar — interpretations which cannot even agree on what politics are—Professor Hall believes that any attempt to read political attitudes, modern or Renaissance, falsifies it. Rather, he feels, Shakespeare is faithful to Plutarch, whose purpose was ethical rather than political. Julius Caesar is filled with the Roman ideal of virtus. A survey of the characters reveals that they are above all Roman. They may have faults, for they are presented as men, but they are Romans and noble Romans at that. Thus, for example, Caesar, living or dead, remains to everyone in the play, a symbol of the imperial glory of Rome. And, in another, Brutus is the exemplar of all private and civic virtues, of Roman moral superiority. The style, too, is Roman—dignified and chaste. The vocabulary is unusually small, introducing only seventy new words. The great scenes are written "with such a consciousness of the rules of rhetoric that one can almost imagine Shakespeare with a Quintilian or Cicero in his hands as he composed them." The very names of the characters are symbolic, as Shakespeare not only avoids the pronoun but also repeats the names to a remarkable degree. Of great significance is the fact that the word Rome or Roman appears seventy-two times. Thus, the author concludes, "every element in th play, style, images, and character, leads us to the conclusion that Shakespeare had no political point in mind when he wrote Julius Caesar. It is a celebration of Roman nobility and stoic virtue. But it is more than this. It is a tragedy of a deeper and more human kind than those have seen who have attempted to read political interpretations into it. It is the tragedy, too often repeated in the world, of honorable men, each believing in the rightness of his cause, compelled to bloodshed and destruction." (SERD, 1959, pp. 106-24.)

### "Enter Citizens"

**Matthew Black, University of Pennsylvania**

To test the assumption that an artist with a sufficient interest in people is incapable of creating characters entirely devoid of individuality, Professor Black analyzes the most minor figures in the plays of the great Elizabethan dramatists, especially Shakespeare: "those little groups of background figures categorized as citizens, soldiers, sailors, watchmen, or in countless other ways, and numbered 1, 2, 3, 4—or higher occasionally—who speak and contribute something to the progress of the play, and in particular contribute something other than the choric function of commenting on the action."

A survey of the history of numeraries reveals that they are almost completely absent in Greek and Roman drama, as well as in the first regular comedies in English. They are abundant, however, in the English miracle plays, where they are a kind of device that would appeal to a naive audience as realism. As there was little use of the device in moralities and interludes, the transference from miracle to regular play was accomplished directly in the 1580's, the device solidly established in the early history play. Shakespeare himself was more fond of numeraries than any of his contemporaries: although Kyd did bestow individuality upon them (e.g., the three Watchmen in The Spanish Tragedy, III,iii) and Marlowe had a strong feeling for them (e.g., the three Jews in The Jew of Malta, I,i), there is little use for them in Lyly, Greene, and Peele; and in Dekker, Heywood, and Jonson the use of humor names tends to displace numbered groups. In Shakespeare, however, only five plays are entirely without numbered groups. They are least used in the comedies; they become increasingly used in the tragedies.

Their functions are manifold. "They appear as nuntii, as expositors, as comedians with their straight men, as leaders with their yes men, as identical representatives of various groups, as symbolic figures, and . . . with farcical identity." The most remarkable numbered group, carefully individualized, is the four Citizens in Julius Caesar, III,ii. "1 speaks first because he is naturally forthcoming, responsive, impulsive. 2 is consciously individualistic . . . . 3 is the kind of man who loves to 'shush' others . . . 4 . . . sets great value on words for their own sake."

Although the device has tended to disappear, and there are times when individuality in bit parts would be intrusive, it is worth noting, the author concludes, "that Shakespeare's most deliberate personalizing of nameless speakers, though it bears out our admiration of his sensitive feeling for the infinite variety of common men, leads in the end to an ironic reflection upon their human weakness." (SERD, 1959, pp. 16-27.)

### Maps for Shakespeare's Plays

Wall maps to illustrate the scenes and geographical locations of the areas in Macbeth and Julius Caesar have been prepared by Lawrence E. Connolly of Educational Illustrators. The 22" by 32" sheets show the pertinent places surrounded by a dozen illustrations from scenes in the plays. They are priced at a dollar and may be had by writing Mr. Connolly at 43 West Lincoln St., Westerville, Ohio.

### Shakespeare's Sonnets and The French Academie

**Verna M. Parish, Fort Hays Kansas, S. C.**

The French Academie by Pierre de la Primaudaye (1577), Englished from 1586-1618, contains ideas interesting to students of Shakespeare's sonnets. In the sonnets addressed to the young man, Shakespeare introduces the love-friendship theory. Friendship as a binding and harmonizing force reiterates a classical theme prevalent in Renaissance literature. He also touches upon the ideas of friends having one soul and of a friend being a second self. Primaudaye expresses these same concepts in his highly moralistic prose.

In Elizabethan literature the scriptural plan of marriage as a means of greater happiness to man though the companionship of woman is emphasized. In sonnets (1-17) Shakespeare falls into this literary tradition by urging the friend to marry and preserve the lineage of man. Too, children assure immortality, and care in old age. Again, Primaudaye emphasizes like concepts. To vivify the arguments for procreation both employ the imagery of the gardener; to underline the happiness parents derive from seeing their images reproduced in children use the imagery of the looking glass.

These concepts of friendship, of friends as one, of the scriptural marriage union, of the duty of parenthood, and of the joys derived from children set forth the obvious parallels; others exist. These similarities make no case that Shakespeare used or even knew The French Academie; they do, however, call attention to the fact that, in another work important to Renaissance writers, these ideas prevail. The real significance of these similarities lies in the additional evidence they offer that, in writing the sonnets, Shakespeare was in a literary tradition, and that to try to find biographical data in his "sugared sonnets" is at best hazardous.

**Presented to**
**Frank Percy Wilson**
**in honour of his**
**seventieth birthday**

**Elizabethan and Jacobean Studies**

Edited by HERBERT DAVIS and HELEN GARDNER

These twenty essays have been written by the English and American colleagues and friends of F. P. Wilson and deal with critical and bibliographical problems including some fresh documents and some delightful reminiscences of a great Shakespearean scholar . 5 plates.

$6.75

**AT ALL BOOKSTORES**

Oxford University Press

## LANDMARKS OF CRITICISM

**Edited by Edmund Creeth, Univ. of Michigan**

**Shylock, The History of a Character, or The Myth of the Jew**
**Hermann Sinsheimer**

(London, 1947, 144 pp. plus illus.)

Giving lasting poetical form to a myth that he knew in common with his audience, Shakespeare created in Shylock a picture of the Jewish people and in **The Merchant of Venice** a document in their history. The tragedy of the Jew—alien, exotic, misunderstood, and wronged—raises a public question of justice as the private tragedy of Othello, the exotic Moor of Venice, does not. The representative of the new, the humanistic and unmedieval in the spiritual struggle of the play is the fair Portia.

The Jews, dispersed after the destruction of their state by the Romans, became a ubiquitous medieval minority whose communities were isolated by their different material and spiritual basis from that of the native populations. The Jew took no responsible part in medieval Europe which, on the other hand, willfully misunderstood him. Militant Christianity could not readily distinguish Jew from heathen. The Jew, it seemed, must worship some god other than the Christian God. The medieval penchant for universalizing and myth-making and the need to objectify the evils of medieval times created the Jew, a monstrous distortion representing a Satanic Judaism. When the Crusaders found the "murderers" of Christ thriving in the Holy Land, Jews became for the first time victims of persecution. Now their investments had to be portable—jewels and money—and many became usurers. "The Jew himself became a mythical figure transferred from medieval reality into an underworld, where the faithful might do with him whatever they pleased." In England, Jews were first exploited and then, in 1290, banished. Their physical exclusion haunted the popular imagination, giving rise to fables of Jewish uncanniness and cruelty. Historical ironies made the Jew seem a homeless phantom, un-English, un-Christian, un-human. Spanish Jews (banished 1492) were doubly foreign. In Venice, the Jew feared both the Inquisition and the charge of subversion in the struggle with Islam.

Gerontus, the saintly usurer in **The Three Ladies of London** (1584), is a compassionate English portrait, but Marlowe's Barabas, the arch-villian, shows what myth could do to an historical personage—Josef, Duke of Naxos. Barabas-Josef reappears, this time small and oppressed, in **Der Jud von Venizien**, where he merges with the fable of the pound of flesh. This, given currency in the time when Jews were thought capable of poisoning wells to cause the plague, had come by Shakespeare's time to be an exemplum for a new model of justice: "An agreement, in itself right, becomes wrong, and the abolition of an agreement, in itself wrong, becomes right."

Simply as a commoner demanding his rights, Shylock is alien in Shakespeare's dramatic world. He is also associated with the Calvinist and Puritan revival of Judaism, hateful to Shakespeare's hellenistic mind—so much for Shakespeare's anti-Semitism. Portia and Antonio are rich and noble by inheritance. She, secure with house, park, servants, and music, can follow her ideals. His capitalism still has about it something of adventure, and he despises money for itself. But Shylock! "He is so much bound to money that it is the essence of his life. He has no landed properties, no ships at sea; he only owns and wants cash, or jewels which are as good as cash. To him money is an end in itself." Portia is surrounded by love, Shylock not even granted love for his own daughter. Venice and Belmont conquer everything foreign. "Shakespeare recognized instinctively that the Jewish tragedy is consummated within the comedy of the world."

The trial is unjust, the plaintiff a lone figure with restricted rights, the defendant a patrician surrounded by friends. Shylock (he might have taken but an atom of flesh from his old adversary: "in a merry sport") cannot legally be required to take not an ounce less than his pound. His claim refused, his fortune confiscate, his faith changed by compulsion, he is not, however, merely the Jew Shylock but, as Rudolph von Ihering says, "the typical figure of the medieval Jew, that pariah of society, who cried in vain for justice." "The unique achievement of the Shakespearian character is that memories and conceptions from past centuries find expression in—and are lit up by—a starkly realistic figure." Yet this myth incarnate carries himself with dignity, raises the sacred question of Law, and utters noble sentiments which Shakespeare must have shared. In a sense, his "Shylockiad" becomes a "most ingenious satire on justice and courts of law . . . . Shylock thinks that he has the law in his hands. He has indeed—but it is only the Jew's law."

## The International Conference—Stratford, 1959 (conc.)

**SHAKESPEARE VERSUS THE REST - T. J. B. Spencer, University of Birmingham**

Professor Spencer began by noting the variety of comparisons made between Shakespeare and the rival dramatists of his time. Dryden, in Professor Spencer's view, was the stallion that begat most of the critical mares' nests and hobby horses of subsequent times. For instance, a traditional comparison lay in Shakespeare's supposed deficiency in female characterization and Fletcher's greater success, contrary to theatrical experience. It was Coleridge's great discovery to be exploited throughout the nineteenth century, that Shakespeare's women characters were remarkable in that you felt like marrying them. Dryden's most brilliant kind of critical work failed to establish a tradition; his analysis of **The Silent Woman** found no comparable example of the analysis of a single Elizabethan play until the mid-eighteenth century; and then for a long time it was only Shakespeare who received this distinction. Even the scholarly men of letters of the eighteenth century had little regard for Shakespeare's contemporaries. In Dr. Johnson's **Dictionary** hardly any quotations are given from dramatists other than Shakespeare (who provided fifteen percent), except a little Ben Jonson and Fletcher. There were editions of Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher and, remarkably, Massinger, in the earlier part of the eighteenth century but that was all.

It was Robert Dodsley, the enterprising publisher and bookseller, whose twelve volumes contained sixty old plays, who provided the material to destroy Dryden's commonplace that Shakespeare "found not, but created first the stage." Even so, by the beginning of the nineteenth century the intelligent reader could learn very little of Shakespeare's rival playwrights. The new generation of men of letters, (Lamb their pioneer) set to work to remedy the situation; Sir Walter Scott was a powerful influence with his **Ancient British Drama** of 1810, a kind of popularization of Dodsley. Gifford edited Massinger, Ben Jonson and Ford. Scott's friend Weber was to edit Ford and also Beaumont and Fletcher; Dyce dealt with Peele, Webster, Greene, Shirley and Middleton; Robinson edited Marlowe.

The early years of the nineteenth century were the age of personal enthusiasm for the dramatists, irradiated by a sense of discovery or re-discovery, which we can only envy. The publication of readable editions made possible the comparison of their merits with Shakespeare's. Lamb stated the new problem "How much of Shakespeare shines in the great men his contemporaries, and how far in his divine mind and manners he surpassed them and all mankind." Some of the new admirers of the old dramatists began to express themselves without just proportion and Coleridge vigorously protested. One of his important tasks was to correct this perspective. Dyce, too, was consistent in his view of Shakespeare's immeasurable superiority. A grave objection to the full acceptance of the drama of Shakespeare's time as an adjunct to his works, lay in that they were unsuitable for family reading. Expurgated editions followed, but what was needed was a series of cheap reprints, and these were supplied by Vizitelly. His famous Mermaids, despite difficulties, took root and flourished. They were widely read, and the old poetic drama rapidly became a pervasive influence in the new English poetry.

The central critical problem which Professor Spencer thought had emerged from the Conference, was to define the gulf between these dramatists and Shakespeare. That the gulf exists no one probably would deny, but its size and nature were what we should try to determine with the help of the tools of criticism available. Was Shakespeare's superiority such that we must consider his suigeneris? Had he a unique mind and art, reflected in his plays? Or was he only the best of a group—doing better than his contemporaries what they also did?

**Discussion Chairman: Prof. Michael Grivelet**

Prof. W. Chwalewik asked Prof. Spencer whether he did not think that Jonson's panegyric in the Folio and Meres' words in **Palladis Tamia** made it unambiguously clear that Shakespeare's contemporaries did consider him the supreme dramatic poet. Professor Spencer pointed out, in answer, that Meres' opinions were not the work of a consistent critical mind, and that Jonson's praise by the very nature of its occasion, could hardly be accepted as considered criticism. Exception was taken to this stricture on Jonson by Professor F. P. Wilson who said he could recall only two comparable tributes in English literature: Scott's on Jane Austen and Fielding's on Richardson. He stressed also that, while the literary evidence of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries implied greater estimation of Jonson at that time, the purely theatrical evidence indicated that Shakespeare was held in greater esteem.

In endeavoring to estimate the nature and size of the gulf separating Shakespeare's achievement from that of his fellows, Professor M. Mincoff believed that while we may perhaps find Shakespeare's equals as a poet or his equals in dramatic portraiture, it is in the rare combination of these two qualities that his uniqueness lay. A plea was made on behalf of Bowdler and the other castrators of Elizabethan drama by Mr. J. Crow, Professor Dover Wilson and Dr. H. Brooks; all three felt that given the market for which they were working, their methods were justifiable. Professor H. T. Price stressed the necessity of considering Shakespeare's style from the dramatic rather than the poetic viewpoint. Professor Spencer agreed that "Shakespeare's bad writing is as good in its badness as his good writing in its goodness."

No Vacation for SNL
We'll Be Planning the 1960-61 Issues
Expecting Brief Notes and Articles
And Also (Please),
Subscription Extensions
for Two or More Years

# OPHELIA EXONERATED

Marion A. Taylor, Southern Illinois University

Ophelia has long been called one of the weakest of Shakespeare's heroines. "A timid, conventional girl." "Too fragile a reed for a man to lean upon." "Hamlet loves her, and she loves Hamlet, but it is not a love that will bear him through the deep waters of affliction."

Worse, Ophelia has been called "a shallow vessel," a symbol for stupid. Furthermore, she has been dubbed "no mate for Hamlet; yet in her own sphere, she is a beautiful and lovable character."

Because I believe many of such indictments are unfair, let us re-examine certain passages in Hamlet to see if we cannot exonerate Ophelia.

In the early scene of the play (I.iii) in which Laertes is saying farewell to his sister and giving her advice, Ophelia gives a few answers which could certainly be interpreted as tongue-in-cheek. (II.iv.3). Especially when Laertes gives her a long speech of sordid advice about Hamlet (10f), she thanks him, but asks him not to give her any advice he would not follow himself, which I call a spirited answer.

In II.1.87 f., we have Ophelia's agitated report to her father about Hamlet's behavior:

> Oph. He took me by the wrist and held me hard; Then goes he to the length of all his arm; And, with his other hand thus o'er his brow, He falls to such a perusal of my face As he would draw it . . .

The consensus with regard to this scene is that Hamlet, seeking strength for the terrible deed he is forced to carry out, turns naturally to his beloved Ophelia. But he knows in his heart she is not strong enough to give him the help he needs. Her frightened eyes confirm it, he thinks, and he reluctantly turns her off. Then she, the tattletale, goes home and tells her father.

But have the critics and Hamlet necessarily come to the right conclusion? To be sure, not burdening Ophelia with his terrible secret shows the fineness of Hamlet's nature. But was this really kind? Does not true love consist of confiding, sharing burdens? And did not Ophelia suffer more terribly from Hamlet's not confiding in her than if he had? When Hamlet turned her off, what else was she to think but that Hamlet did not want her any more? An in her terrible agitation, she goes to her father, I believe, for help for Hamlet. That failing, she is eventually driven to heartbreak, madness, and death.

Critics of Act 2, Scene 2, have labelled Ophelia "shallow" for not seeing through Hamlet's feigned madness, even though the poor girl does not appear on the stage. But Gertrude, Polonius, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern do not see through Hamlet's feigned madness either. In fact, no one suspects Hamlet except the King, and he only because he has a guilty heart. So why should Ophelia alone be singled out here as being "shallow?"

But it is the famous scene (III. 1) in which Ophelia lets her father use her as bait to try to trap Hamlet, which has called out the most criticism against this unfortunate girl. "Polonius' puppet," she has been called. "So weak, she lies to her lover because her father bade her."

True, Ophelia obeys her father in this. But she is also following the Queen's suggestion (37 f.) that Hamlet is mad for love of her (Ophelia) and that there is hope that Ophelia's "virtues Will bring him to his wonted way again. . . ." Does Ophelia not agree to serve as bait to trap her beloved Hamlet because she feels that this may be the one desperate hope left to her to save him, and she is now snatching at straws?

In the same scene, after the famous "To be or not to be" soliloquy could we not argue therefore, we have Ophelia going through with the trap scene to help the "mad" Hamlet even lying to her beloved, but reaping only his suspicion and deep hurt? Then follows the pathetic speech of Ophelia (III. i. 158 f.) in which she believes Hamlet is hopelessly mad and pities him. But the critics too often forget that her own heart is breaking here as well as Hamlet's.

In III. ii, we have the play within a play scene in which Hamlet bids Ophelia sit beside him, but still makes jibes at her. (119f., 164, etc.) Does not this bring more suffering to the poor girl?

In IV. v, Ophelia is mad. And the reasons? (1) Laertes has left her for Paris. (2) Hamlet has turned her off without giving her any reasons. (3) Hamlet has killed her father and left Ophelia with no one to turn to. I repeat, if Hamlet had confided in Ophelia, probably most of these tragedies could have been prevented; all in fact, but the first, which was not really a tragedy.

That Hamlet loved Ophelia, we have the ringing lines of the graveyard scene for proof (V. i. 292 f.):

> Ham. I loved Ophelia; forty thousand brothers Could not, with all their quantity of love, Make up my sum.

And that Ophelia loved Hamlet we have for proof that she goes mad when she loses him. Yet she would have made Hamlet an excellent wife. For she suited this brilliant man more than a more brilliant woman would have done, even one with the charm and heart of Portia. Hamlet needed someone to adore him and look up to him and embellish him, and this Ophelia would have done if Hamlet had given her half a chance.

Furthermore, I believe that if Hamlet had confided in Ophelia, he might have found the opposite of "too fragile a reed for a man to lean upon." For proof, I turn to Sonia Marmelodov in Dostoyevsky's CRIME AND PUNISHMENT, to whom the brilliant intellectual, Rodion Roskolnikov, confessed his murders.

Sonia was almost exactly the same kind of young woman as Ophelia. A frail, shy girl, Sonia finds herself in the midst of a terrible tragedy. Her father is a hopeless alcoholic, unable to hold a job; her step-mother is a consumptive with death upon her; Sonia's two step-sisters and her step-brother are facing starvation.

When the step-mother suggests that Sonia practice prostitution to earn the living, Sonia quails. But she makes herself do it—night after night. And that was a far worse thing than Ophelia's father demanded of her.

It takes practically the whole of the long novel for Rodion to reveal his murders to Sonia. And when he does, her agony is terrible.

Then, before our very eyes, this frail girl turns into living steel. First she urges Rodion to confess his crimes. And when he does, she follows him to Siberia. Then after a mighty struggle, she saves his soul.

Heroic? Electra of the old Greek tragedies is not more so. But Sonia was not born heroic. She was born shy, trembling. It was only the fires of life and the terrible burdens her lover cast upon her that forged her into a tower of strength that supported a whole family and regenerated a murderer.

What happened to Sonia might well have happened to Ophelia, had Hamlet shared his terrible secret with her.

"A shallow vessel"? "Too fragile a reed for a man to lean on"? I can only answer that with another question. Did life and Hamlet give the fair Ophelia a fair chance?

COLORADO SHAKESPEARE FESTIVAL

July 30 to August 13
in repertory
staged in the Mary Rippon
Outdoor Theatre

I HENRY IV
ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA
TWELFTH NIGHT

Information and mail order forms may be obtained by addressing a card to:
Colorado Shakespeare Festival
Boulder, Colorado

Produced by the University Theatre and the Creative Arts Program

J. H. Crouch, Executive Director

JUNE 27 SEPT. 17
STRATFORD FESTIVAL
Canada

Three Plays by William Shakespeare
Julie Harris • Christopher Plummer
Bruno Gerussi
ROMEO AND JULIET

Christopher Plummer • Julie Harris
Douglas Rain
KING JOHN

Kate Reid • Tony VanBridge
A MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM

DIRECTORS
Michael Langham • Douglas Seale
Douglas Campbell

Gilbert and Sullivan's
H.M.S. PINAFORE
Directed by TYRONE GUTHRIE

THE NATIONAL FESTIVAL ORCHESTRA

INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL

For complete brochure, write to Festival Publicity Office, Stratford, Ontario.

# SHAKESPEARE AND THE ARMY: A BIBLIOGRAPHY

Robert C. Steensma
State University of South Dakota

For quite a few years we have been contemplating a series of bibliographies on specialized aspects of Shakespeare which might be useful to those who wanted a fairly respectable introduction to a particular field.

Limited in time as we were, we advertised in SNL and our volunteer has submitted the first in the series. Others are being prepared. If subscribers have additions, or similar bibliographies of other subjects, correspondence is invited. Meanwhile we hope that these will be useful to the scholar and to the student at work on graduate and undergraduate papers.

Shakespeare's treatment of Elizabethan military life has been carefully studied by Paul A. Jorgensen in Shakespeare's Military World (Los Angeles and Berkeley, 1956), but no extensive bibliography on the subject has ever been published. The following bibliography lists, first, books and articles dealing with the military backgrounds of the later Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and, secondly, works treating Shakespeare's use of this material in his plays.

### I. The Military Background


Anon. "Manners and Costumes," Social England, ed. H. D. Traill (London, 1895), III, 153-169.

Bateson, F. W. (ed.). "The Social Background: The Art of War," CBEL (Cambridge, 1941), I, 389-390.

Borinski, Ludwig. " 'Soldat'und 'Politiker' bei Sh. und seinen Zeitgenossen," SJ, XCI (1955), 87-120.

Cockle, M. J. D. (comp.). A Bibliography of English Military Books up to 1642. London, 1900.

Cruickshank, C. G. "Dead-pay in the Elizabethan Army," EHR, LIII (1938), 93-97.

———. Elizabeth's Army. London, 1946.

Davis, William S. Life in Elizabethan Days (New York, 1930), pp. 291-309.

Dillon, Viscount. "Armour and Weapons," Shakespeare's England, ed. C. T. Onions (Oxford, 1916), I, 127-140.

Ffoulkes, C. J. Armour and Weapons. Oxford, 1909.

———. The Armourer and His Craft from the XIth to the XVIth Century. London, 1912.

Fortescue, Sir J. W. A History of the British Army (New York and London, 1899-1930), I, Book II, 108-172.

———. "The Soldier," Shakespeare's England, I, 112-116.

Meyer, George W. "Order out of Chaos in Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida," Tulane Studies in English, IV (1954), 45-56.

Oman, Sir Charles. "The Art of War," Social England, III, 70-77, 196-202, and 450-457.

———. A History of the Art of War in the Middle Ages. 2nd ed. London, 1924.

———. A History of the Art of War in the 16th Century. New York. 1937.

Rowse, A. L. "War on Land: Military Organization," The Expansion of Elizabethan England (New York, 1955), pp. 327-373.

Salzman, L. F. England in Tudor Times (New York, 1926), pp. 117-125.

Schanzer, Ernest, Shakespeare's Appian, A Selection from the Tudor Translation of Appian's Civil Wars, Liverpool University Press, 1956.

Spaulding, T. M. "Elizabethan Military Books," J. Q. Adams Memorial Studies, ed. James G. McManaway, Giles E. Dawson, and Edwin E. Willoughby (Washington, 1948), pp. 495-507.

Wavell, Major the Earl. "Shakespeare and Soldiering," EDH, N. S. XXVII (1955), 140-151.

Webb, H. J. "English Military Books, Laws, and Proclamations Published from 1513 to 1610," PQ, XXIII (1944), 116-128.

———. "The Science of Gunnery in Elizabethan England," Isis, XLV (1954), 10-21.


### II. The Army in Shakespeare's Plays


Boas, F. S. "The Soldier in Elizabethan and Later English Drama," EDH, N. S. XIX (1942), 121-156.

Bossler, Robert. "Was Macbeth a Victim of Battle Fatigue?" CE, VIII (1947), 436-438.

Boughner, Daniel C. The Braggart in Renaissance Comedy. Minneapolis, 1954.

———. "Traditional Elements in Falstaff," JEGP, XLIII (1944), 417-428.

Campbell, Lily B. "The Victorious Acts of King Henry V," Shakespeare's Histories: Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy (San Marino, 1947), pp. 255-305.

Cooper, Duff. Sergeant Shakespeare. New York, 1949.

Cruttwell, Patrick. "The War's and Fortune's Son," Essays in Criticism, II (1952), 24-37.

Daugherty, George H. Jr. "Shakespeare as a Military Critic," Open Court, XLII (1928), 257-276.

Delattre, F. "Shakespeare et la Guerre," Les Langues Modernes, XLI (1947), 271-297.

Draper, John W. "Captain General Othello," Anglia, LV (1931), 296-310.

———. "Othello and Elizabethan Army Life," Revue Anglo-Americaine, IX (1932), 319-326.

———. "Sir John Falstaff," RES, VIII (1932), 414-424.

Feldman, Abraham B. "Playwrights and Pike-Trailers in the Low Countries," N&Q, XCCVIII (1953), 184-187.

Greer, C. A. "The Source of Falstaff's Contamination in the Army," N&Q, XCCVIII (1953), 236-237.

Jorgenson, Paul A. "A Divided Command in Shakespeare," PMLA, LXX (1955), 750-761.

———. "Military Rank in Shakespeare," HLQ, XIV (1950), 17-41.

———. " ' My Name is Pistol Call'd'," SQ, I (1950), 73-75.

———. "Shakespeare's Coriolanus: Elizabethan Soldier," PMLA, LXIV (1949), 221-235.

———. Shakespeare's Military World. Los Angeles and Berkeley, 1956. The notes contain additional primary and secondary references.

———. "Shakespeare's Use of War and Peace," HLQ, XVI (1953), 319-352.

Knowlton, E. C. "Falstaff Redux," JEGP, XXV (1926), 193-215.

Laird, J. "Shakespeare and the Wars of England," Philosophy, XVIII (1943), 140-154.

Langsam, G. G. Martial Books and Tudor Verse. New York, 1951.

Melsome, W. S. "Bacon, Shakespeare, and War," Baconiana, XXVII(1943), 60-68.

Moore, John R. "Othello, Iago, and Cassio as Soldiers," PQ, XXXI (1952), 189-194.

Stopes, C. C. "Shakespeare and War," ConR, XCVII (1915), 1057-1070.

Thoms, W. J. "Was Shakespeare Ever a Soldier?" Three Notelets on Shakespeare (London, 1865), pp 115-136.

Webb, H. J. "Elizabethan Soldiers: A Study in the Ideal and Real," WHR, IV (1950), 144-149.

———. "Falstaff's Clothes," MLN, LIX (1944), 162-164.

———. "Falstaff's 'Tardy Tricks'," MLN, LVIII (1943), 377-379.

———. "The Military Background in Othello," PQ, XXX (1951), 40-52.


### The Misused Sacrament in King John

Robert F. Fleissner, Univ. of North Carolina

Michael Quinn in his recent article, " 'The King is not Himself': The Personal Tragedy of Richard II," SP, LVI (1959), 169-186, makes two suggestions which may be related advantageously to a study of King John. The first is that Shakespeare's history play may indeed be construed as a tragedy; the second, that kingship was largely considered as a sacrament (see 169, 171). The two points are related; for if a king misuses his sacramental responsibilities, he is prone to fall ("a bad priest may consecrate validly but by definition a bad king rules badly"). If this be the case in Richard II, it is even more pertinent in King John—and the concept of the "sacrament" takes on an added significance. Here the protagonist violates his obligations by turning upon the very party which annointed him. In scorning excommunication, he ironically challenges his own "Divine Right"; when he then deliberately persecutes the Catholic Church, there is little wonder that he dies apparently ("I feare") at the hands of a monk.

The sacramental aspect of his downfall is emphasized by two references to the Eucharist in the play. France first admonishes Pandulph for marching "a bloody hoast" upon "the marriage bed/Of smiling peace," making "a ryot on the gentle brow/Of true sincerity" (III.1). The word "bloody" (used so often throughout the play) has, I presume, more of a denotative than connotative significance here. Although "hoast" is not capitalized, it certainly refers to the Eucharist (Pandulph does not march in a host of men!). Furthermore, the Dauphin specifically remarks later that "we took the Sacrament,/And keepe oure faithes firme and inuiolable" (V.2). Since he says this before a battle, he unquestionably means that he has received Communion—but he also connotes by this that King John is guilty of sacramental neglect.

The fact that Shakespeare's attitude here is definitely not anti-Catholic (though it may be non-Catholic) has been carefully analyzed in Rev. Gerard M. Greenewald's dissertation, Shakespeare's Attitude Towards the Catholic Church in "King John" (Washington, 1938). In spite of his later Henry VIII (and it is uncertain just how much of this he actually composed), Shakespeare's revisions of The Troublesome Raigne indicate that he could well have believed that a Catholic king's misuse of a holy sacrament might end in tragedy.

---

The cartoon above is one of a series devised by Sidney Smith of Cleveland. He invites inquiries from interested parties and publishers.

**Bernard Grebanier, The Heart of Hamlet; The Play Shakespeare Wrote, New York, Crowell, pp. 311, $4.95.**

In this volume, as in Allan Gilbert's Principles and practices of Criticism, there is a reaction to the obscurantism that passes for criticism, and the shenanigans that accompany Shakespeare when presented on the stage and screen. If since the 18th century Shakespeare has been elucidated into obscurity, Professor Grebanier of Brooklyn College attempts to clear the underbrush. But Grebanier is too much a scholar to be able to put himself completely into the position of the unShakespearean barber with whom the author went to see the play about forty years ago and whose final reaction was: "Wasa damn good! Molto simpatico e naturale. Geesa I wasa scare!" He had to unlearn a good deal before he came to his present conclusions. The book is delightful if somewhat self-centered. I say this because my own experience tells me that hundreds of other teachers teach Hamlet in much the same way as he does. This 300 page analysis and synthesis can only have a salutary influence on many teachers, students, directors, actors, and even scholars who will perhaps climb aboard the bandwagon leading a procession back to the plays as plays rather than as a vehicle for self-expression and intellectual gymnastics,—"intellectual bubble-blowing" I think Douglas Bush called it. Hamlet is not about a man who procrastinates or feigns madness. There is no delay; the intellect controlled the sword in the "praying" scene. Nor is the climax of the play the "mouse-trap" scene (J. D. Wilson), the "now might I do it pat" scene, or "the readiness is all" scene (S. F. Johnson), but rather the killing of Polonius. Until now all has been well managed; now the Prince is pursued instead of being the pursuer. And this act gives us Hamlet's tragic flaw—rashness! "Hamlet falls not because he is too timid, too sensitive, too thoughtful or too scrupulous, but because he is too rash, too overweening, too heedless." Professor Grebanier does not suggest that Hamlet should have taken a peek behind the arras to ascertain that it was not the king he was killing, nor are we told where else this flaw is exhibited. We are also told that Brutus, Othello, Macbeth, Lear, and Cleopatra have the same flaw. However, if one cannot accept all the "obvious" truths that are presented in this stimulating study, (the Professor is rather dogmatic about his point of view while attacking others relentlessly) we see here a critic and teacher with a dynamic mind.

**Mary Clarke, Shakespeare at the Old Vic, New York, Macmillan, 1958, (For the Old Vic Trust Ltd by Hamish Hamilton Ltd), unpaged.**

This volume is the fifth in the series devoted to the pictorial history of the Old Vic Five Year Plan to produce the complete plays of Shakespeare. In over ninety beautiful photographs by Angus McBean, Houston Rogers, David Sim, and the now doubly famous Tony Armstrong Jones, and an interesting commentary by Mary Clarke the history of the fifth season and its problems is unfolded. The plays illustrated in the volume are Hamlet, 1, 2, and 3 Henry VI, Measure for Measure, A Midsummer Night's Dream, King Lear, Twelfth Night, and Henry VIII. Old Vic, now virtually self supporting, had to eliminate Pericles and Sir Thomas More from the proposed program because of reduced contributions from the Arts Council. A revival of Twelfth Night replaced Pericles because it was the School Certificate play of that year and had a large assured audience. If there are any difficulties, they are caused by the fact that it functions as a National Theatre but is forced to operate as an ordinary repertory theatre. Top salary for its stars is $126 per week.

The five volume set presents a vivid panorama of Shakespeare production in the mid-twentieth century.

**Allan Gilbert, The Principles and Practice of Criticism: Othello, The Merry Wives, Othello, Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1959, pp. 152, $4.50.**

An extension of a series of lectures given at Wayne State University, this volume is bound to provoke interest because it is based on the premises that plays are written to give pleasure, "long and devious ratiocination" is to be rejected, and if there are two views, "the simpler gets preferential treatment." The idea is to look at the plays "without pre-influence and prejudgment." After a look at Aristotle, Plato, Sidney, and Croce and clearing up some misimpressions of them (Plato only banished bad poets; the unity of action is all that Aristotle demanded; Aristotle only requires that a play to be excellent need excel in one particular rather than in all), Professor Gilbert turns a long-experienced eye on the three plays chosen for his lectures. Hamlet is not important as tragedy alone. Instead of trying to account for Hamlet's delay, it is more important to look at the things that Hamlet had to say while delaying. The comic lines in the play are not merely relief for the tragedy but significant in their own right. Accordingly his analysis concentrates on the comic aspects of the play, the puns, the teasing of Osric, the burlesque of high tragedy ("now could I drink blood"), sarcasm toward his mother, incongruity, mockery of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, wittiness with the guards and his uncle when they are seeking the dead Polonius, jesting with the king, in the same scene, comical satire and fooling in the graveyard, ranting at Ophelia's grave, etc. While others since Pope have noted the comedy in the play, the current work differs in that the author insists that Shakespeare would not have written a pure revenge play when others were satirizing the genre. "If Shakespeare ruined the pure type of tragedy by adding comedy, why should we strive to retain the wreckage of that type?" Shakespeare can do as he pleases. The play is a great play if not a great tragedy.

**The First Book of Consort Lessons, Collected by Thomas Morley 1599 & 1611, Reconstructed and edited by Sydney Beck, The New York Public library Music Publications, C. F. Peters Corporation, New York, 1959, pp. 194 $25.00 paper; $35.00 cloth. Limited to 1000 copies.**

The popularity of Morley's Consort Lessons is testified to by the trouble and twenty years that it took to produce this reconstructed edition by Sydney Beck. So rare are the two editions of 1599 and 1611 that only seven part-books are known to exist. Some manuscript copies of some parts also survive. Thus from libraries at Oxford, London, New York, California, Washington and elsewhere, the materials were gathered to make this work available for the first time since the 17th century. The Forward by Carleton Sprague Smith and the Introduction and Critical Notes by Sydney Beck are interesting documents on the publication and popularity of the Lessons. Shakespeareans are concerned with Shakespeare's possible collaboration with Morley and the provenance of "O Mistresse mine" from Twelfth Night. The problem of whether the music was not original with Morley, whether Morley and Shakespeare collaborated, or whether Shakespeare wrote with Morley's tune in mind is not solved by this volume, but for lovers of the "broken consort" of six instruments, it will provide a text that is very useful.

**Have You Checked Your Date?**

**Two Year Renewals Appreciated**

**At the MLA, Chicago, Illinois, Dec, 29, 1959:**

**On the Editing of Elizabethan Drama: Or a Note on the Bowers of Light and Darkness**

**Leo Kirschbaum, Wayne State University**

Professor Kirschbaum attacks the editorial methods of Alice Walker, Fredson Bowers, and the contributors to the annual Studies in Bibliography of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia. He charges this school of critics with Platonic bias, that some place, some where, a substantive text has existed, exists, or will exist; a complete absence of the sense that a text by Shakespeare is a drama; an innocent and childlike dependence on the Elizabethan printing house as a place inhabited by automata.

The notion of an absolute Platonic text is untenable in the work of many poets; in the drama the notion becomes pernicious. Shakespeare's plays were performed not in a Platonic heaven but in the Globe Theatre. Hence, editors must be prepared to respect cutting, word changes, etc. Furthermore, it is incumbent on a modern editor to present a text in terms of the Elizabethan playhouse, to explain directions in the notes, to add directions where they are absolutely necessary. Finally, Mr. Kirschbaum objects to "Charlottesville principles Number One and Two": that the average Elizabethan compositor was always numbly consistent, and that he was always dumbly inconsistent.

---

**ON SHAKESPEAREAN HERETICS**

Louis B. Wright, Director of the Folger Library, examines the history of the nature of the anti-Shakespeare theories which have "produced some of the oddest and funniest books in print." The cults favoring the various contestants who are felt to have written Shakespeare's plays "have all the fervor of religion, and indeed, the whole movement is permeated with emotion that sweeps aside the intellectual appraisal of facts, chronology, and the laws of evidence." "Lawyers have shown a special tendency to plead cases against William Shakespeare," because "lawyers are trained to do the best they can for their clients regardless of the weight of evidence against them." Trial lawyers seek to win their cases "by parading a host of friendly witnesses before the jury, even if they have nothing relevant to say, by suppressing evidence damaging to their clients, and by abusing the opposition." This may be good court-room procedure, but it is not scholarship. The cases for all the pretenders rest on "a few simple premises, all of which are erroneous." The anti-Shakespeareans claim that Shakespeare was an ignorant country boy without an education. "This view . . . is a touching illustration of the faith that Americans have in a college education." They claim that only a nobleman could have written of kings and queens. Most of Shakespeare's 'noblest' utterances may be found originally in the pages of Holinshed, a man who worked for a printer. They claim that a mystery surrounds the loss of Shakespeare's manuscripts; but the same mystery surrounds the loss of almost all dramatic documents from the period. They claim that as nothing is known of Shakespeare, he must have been a person of no reputation; but a good deal more information is recorded of Shakespeare than of most of his contemporaries. The Baconians, Oxfordians, Derbians, and others—whose name is Legion—serve, however, a useful purpose. "If these writers were not proving that somebody else wrote the plays, they might be swamping the presses with books about Shakespeare." (The Anti-Shakespeare Industry and the Growth of Cults," Virginia Quarterly Review, XXXV (Spring 1959), 289-303.)

# REVIEW OF PERIODICALS

Barbara Alden; Michael Salamo, Brooklyn College; Marvin Spevack, City College (N.Y.); Joseph H. Summerell, N.Y. State University, Plattsburg; Margaret Lee Wiley, Arlington State College; George W. Williams, Duke.

### JAMES I IN MEASURE FOR MEASURE

David L. Stevenson of Western Reserve University discusses the political substratum which Shakespeare added to his main source, Whetstone's **Promos and Cassandra**, when he wrote the intellectual comedy **Measure for Measure**. He finds the play much concerned with the properties of government and with sufficiency in office. Little has hitherto been said about the political additions to the play, and these he examines in sharper focus: Did Shakespeare feel under obligation to identify his first Jacobean comedy with ideas of the new ruler? Did he wish to inspire the King's personal attachment to the royal players in the time of competitive theatrical enterprise? Did he deliberately create in Duke Vincentio a character whose behavior as a ruler would be attractive to James and to the Jacobean audience because it followed the pattern which the King had already advocated? (Shakespeare incorporated into the action of **M M** a series of James's own attitudes; e.g., conflicting demands of mercy and justice.) Professor Stevenson shows the validity of these contentions through internal and external evidence: From the spring of 1603 to the production of the play, James I was the most discussed person in London. Allusions are demonstrable: the King's distaste for shouting crowds, ideas of statecraft expressed in **Basilicon Doron**, thematic questions, assumption of the right to interfere in the lives of subordinate persons, and the "self-conscious theorizing and attitudinizing" of the Jacobean era. ("The Role of James I in Shakespeare's 'Measure for Measure' ", **ELH**, XXVI:2 (June 1959), 188-208.)

### DYING FOR LOVE

J. K. Walton of Auckland University College, New Zealand, clearly analyzes the implications of **Othello** criticisms from their two main trends established by Rymer (the tragedy of Othello is due to a weakness in him) and by Dr. Johnson-Coleridge-Bradley (the tragedy of Othello is not due to any fault in "the noble Moor") through their developments in recent criticisms. Furthermore he suggests "an interpretation which . . . sees the action of the tragedy as deriving in large part from Othello and Desdemona," and not from their weaknesses, but from their strengths. According to this interpretation, "Iago himself is essentially negative," working through his cynical distortion of the facts of the tragedy on Othello's faith in himself intertwined inextricably with his faith in Desdemona, both faiths being "strengths" of Othello's character. Desdemona likewise falls a victim to her own virtues or "strengths"; so that "we have the appropriate consummation of the tragedy of Othello and Desdemona, for each dies for the love of the other." (" 'Strength's Abundance: A View of Othello," **Rev. of Eng. Stud., N. S. XI**, 41 (February 1960), pp. 8-17.)

THE
SHAKESPEARE NEWSLETTER
Published at Kent, Ohio
Editor and Publisher
LOUIS MARDER
Department of English
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
Kent, Ohio
Six issues annually—Feb., April, May, Sept., Nov., Dec.—Annual Subscription $1.50
Entered as Second Class Matter at the Post Office, Kent, Ohio
Vol. X: No. 3 May, 1960

### " . . . BETHUMP'D WITH WORDS"

Helge Kokeritz vigorously attacks the article by Fredson Bowers, "Hamlet's 'Sullied' or 'Solid' Flesh," **SS IX**, 44-48, which supported the reading 'sullied' in **Hamlet**, I.ii.129. He suggests that "the crux . . . defies an unequivocal solution, because the phonological evidence is ambiguous, as is the context. The only thing certain about the word is that it is not sallied, past participle of sally, vb. 1, 'to leap' or vb. 2 'to issue forth', nor is it the past participle of an unrecorded, non-existent verb sally 'to soil'. It is either solid or sullied and will therefore probably remain a bone of contention among critics till the end of time." Kokeritz then proceeds to discredit Bowers and abuse his linguistic supporter, pointing out that the misreadng u: a is far commoner than Bowers represented and that the alternation -led: -id is found frequently. There is an area of graphic overlapping in which solid and sullied could have been spelled alike. "Bower's argument . . . is completely invalid." ("This Sullied Solid Flesh," **Studia Neophilologica**, XXX:1 (1958), 3-10.)

AN INTRODUCTION TO SHAKESPEARE
By Hardin Craig
Eight Plays and Twenty-one Sonnets
•
Romeo and Juliet, King Richard the Second, King Henry the Fourth, Much Ado About Nothing, Twelfth Night, Hamlet, King Lear, The Tempest.
•
INCLUDES a general introduction, an introduction to each play, bibliographies, and footnotes.
452 pages $2.85 list
Scott Foresman and Company
Chicago Atlanta Dallas Palo Alto
Fair Lawn, N. J.

### WORDS OF NO AUTHORITY

Mr. Hook examines the additions and corrections of five hands in a copy of the first Folio belonging to Mr. Robert B. Honeyman, Jr. Of these hands—seventeenth and eighteenth century—Hand V is the most interesting. This corrector made 106 entries in the text, nearly half in **Romeo and Juliet**, but Mr. Hook admits sadly that none of them has any authority nor can contribute anything to the textual scholar. ("The Manuscript Alterations in the Honeyman First Folio," **Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America**, LIII (1959), 334-338.)

### SHAKESPEARE AS BORROWER

Despite some tenuous parallels, enough evidence has been brought out, asserts Robert A. Law of the University of Texas, to "convict" Shakespeare of repeated borrowing from the anonymous play of **King Leir**—especially in **Richard III** and **1 and 2 Henry VI**. To this list the author now adds echoes of the old play in Shakespeare's **King John**. Two of the closest, neither of which is found in Shakespeare's source-play, **The Troublesome Reign of King John**, are: "The colour of the King doth come, and go" (**King John**, IV. ii. 76) with "See how her colour comes and goes agayne" (**King Leir**, 1. 1173); and "The king hath dispossest himself of vs" (**King John**, IV.iii.23) with "The King hath dispossest himselfe of all" (**King Leir**, 1. 744). But though there are resemblances in situation and thought between **King Leir** and much of III.ii of **King John**, it is "more likely," the author concludes, that Shakespeare's debt is to **The Troublesome Reign**. ("**King John** and **King Leir**," **Texas Studies in Literature and Language**, I:4 (Winter 1960), 473-476.)

### DESDEMONA'S FATE

In spite of nineteenth century commentators and actors who "maintain . . . (that Desdemona) anticipates the Moor's return to her bedroom with forebodings of murderous intention," Thomas D. Bowman of Pennsylvania State University "contends that the prominance of textual evidence points towards Desdemona's gaily anticipating a night of love rather than death, and that she was ignorant of the storm of destruction descending upon her until the last possible moment of dramatic time." "The resultant pity and terror," he points out, "is far more intense than that bestowed upon a heroine beset with painfully whining anxiety and docile subservience to her fate." Faced with a death she has never remotely anticipated, "the full impact of terror induced by the shock of sudden realization then becomes," according to Professor Bowman, "an added weapon against her. Hers is the terror of a girl who wishes to live; Othello interprets it as the terror of a guilty woman brought to retribution." ("Desdemona's Last Moments," **Philological Quarterly**, XXXIX, 1 (January 1960), pp.114-118.)

### Restoring the Guild Chapel

The Guild Chapel in which Shakespeare received his education almost 400 years ago is in the process of being restored to its original condition at great expense. A group known as "Friends of the Guild Chapel" has undertaken the task of raising money through an Activities Committee. Funds are urgently needed to continue the work. Contributions may be sent to Mr. Levi Fox, Chairman of the "Friends," addressed to The Shakespeare Birthplace in Stratford-upon-Avon, England. All gifts will be acknowledged.